

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 14-26 were rejected. Claims 12 and 13 were objected to. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 15 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 27 has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 15 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice and the rejection is believed obviated thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 18, 20, 21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,292,360 (Carteau). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Carteau describes a disk drive subsystem shown in FIGs. 15-18 which show “a standard nineteen inch rack mount 40” which “incorporates five backplane modules 41A, 41B, 41C, 41D, 41E.” The backplane connectors are oriented such that different combinations of one inch disk drive canisters 42 and 1.6 inch disk drive canisters 43 may be plugged into the backplanes, e.g., FIGs. 16-18. See column 5, lines 19-49.

By contrast, claim 18 of the present application recites “a disk drive carrier chassis” which is “configured to receive each of a plurality of disk drive carrier cages, each of the disk drive carrier cages being configured to receive a corresponding one of a plurality of different disk drive carrier types.” Exemplary implementations of the recited cages and the disk drive carriers which they are configured to receive are shown in FIGs. 1 and 2 of the present application. For example, carrier cages 202, 208, and 210 may be alternately mounted on chassis 200 to receive the four different disk drive carriers 101-104 shown in FIG. 1.

If the Examiner is comparing the disk drive “canisters” 42 and 43 of Carteau to the disk drive carriers types recited in claim 18, then Carteau fails to describe the recited disk drive carrier cages configured to receive the different disk drive carrier types. On the other hand, if the

Examiner is comparing Carteau's disk drive canisters to the recited disk drive carrier cages, it is unclear how the described structures are "configured to receive a corresponding one of a plurality of different disk drive carrier types." In either scenario, Carteau fails to disclose key limitations of claim 18.

The fact of the matter is that Carteau's disk drive "canisters" 42 and 43, which plug directly into backplanes 41, likely correspond to the disk drive carriers to which the present application refers. Thus, because there is no description of cages or equivalent structures which are configured to receive the different disk canister types, and further because there is no description of a disk drive carrier chassis configured to receive a plurality of such cages, the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claim 18 over Carteau is believed overcome. The rejection of claims 20, 21, and 23-25 are also believed overcome for at least the reasons discussed.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 14, 16, 17, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,374 (Wong) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,513 (Gallagher). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wong teaches a "hot-pluggable disk drive module design" in which light conduits are employed to bring the light from status indicator lights at the disk drive backplane "to a conspicuous viewing location on the computer cabinet." See Abstract. As can be readily seen with reference to the various figures of Wong, SCA disk drive modules 11-16 all have exactly the same form factor, and each plugs into an identically positioned connector 34 on backplane 23. Wong makes it clear that these modules are the same by stating that "[e]ach disk drive module 11 through 16 consists of a modular disk drive tray into which is mounted *a standard SCA disk drive*" (col. 3, lines 21-23; emphasis added).

By contrast, claim 1 of the present application recites “a connector for interfacing with a corresponding connector on each of [a plurality of disk drive] carrier types.” Wong fails to show this important feature. That is, as described above, all of connectors 34 on Wong’s backplane 23 are described and shown as identically positioned SCA connectors for connecting with identical configured SCA disk drives 11-16. As described in the present specification, while different types of disk drive carriers may employ the same industry standard connector, the positioning of those connectors are different from vendor to vendor. See FIG. 1 and the corresponding description on page 4. Because connectors 34 on backplane 23 are identically positioned, they are therefore are not operable to interface with different carrier types as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner referred to column 2, lines 64-65, as anticipating the plurality of disk drive carrier types recited in the claims. However, it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that this reference is misplaced. That is, the drives to which Wong refers are clearly the conventional 3.5 and 5.25 inch floppy drives which are standard in any personal computer manufactured at the time Wong was filed. These drives are shown (without reference numbers) at the top of the cabinet in FIG. 1. And with respect to these disk drives, there is no mention made of a “disk drive backplane” having “a plurality of status indicator arrays” each of which is “positioned to interface with a corresponding status interface on the at least one corresponding carrier type.” Absent such description, the manner in which these drives are secured within the computer cabinet can only be considered to be done conventionally.

In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claim 1 is believed overcome for at least the reasons discussed. The rejection of claims 2-11, 14, 16, 17, and 26 is also believed overcome for at least these reasons.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly describe the invention. Given the distinguishing remarks above, these amendments are not presented for any

reason related to patentability. Rather, these amendments are being provided for clarification purposes only. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite "a plurality of differently configured status indicator arrays associated with the connector." An example of this may be found in FIG. 3A of the present application which shows 3 different status indicator arrays A, B, and C associated with each connector 302. This provides yet another distinction from the teachings of Wong which provides only a single array configuration (LEDs 27) associated with each connector 34.

The Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carteau in view of Wong. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18, the rejection of claim 22 is believed overcome.

Finally, the Examiner objected to claims 12 and 13 as being dependent on rejected base claims but indicated that these claims contained allowable subject matter. In view of the foregoing discussion, these claims are believed to be allowable in their current form without amendment.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (510) 663-1100.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Joseph M. Villeneuve  
Reg. No. 37,460

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, California 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100